

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Office Action mailed June 12, 2008 and offers the following remarks to accompany the above amendments.

Claim 1 has been amended to add the limitations of dependent claim 4. Claim 15 has been amended to include the limitations of dependent claim 18. Claim 29 has been amended to include the limitations of dependent claim 30. Claims 4, 18, and 30 are therefore cancelled. Claims 5, 19, and 31 have been amended to maintain proper dependency.

Claims 1-3, 5-17, 19-29, and 31-36 remain pending.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 5-14, 19-28, and 31-36 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant reserves the right to rewrite claims 5-14, 19-28, and 31-36 at a later time, but respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable in light of the above amendments and the arguments set forth below.

Claims 1-4, 15-18, 29, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,091,808 to Wood et al. (hereinafter "Wood"). Applicant respectfully traverses. For the Patent Office to prove anticipation, each and every element of the claims must be present in the reference. Furthermore, the elements of the reference must be arranged as claimed. M.P.E.P. § 2131.

Claim 1 as amended now recites the steps of:

sending a subscriber identification request for display at the subscriber terminal;
receiving a response to the subscriber identification request including subscriber authentication data; and
validating the subscriber authentication data.

Claims 15 and 29 recite similar limitations.

Wood does not teach the steps of "sending a subscriber identification request for display at the subscriber terminal," "receiving a response to the subscriber identification request including subscriber authentication data," and "validating the subscriber authentication data," as recited in the claimed invention. The Patent Office alleges these limitations are taught in column 2, lines 21-30 of Wood (Office Action mailed June 12, 2008, p. 3). Column 2, lines 21-30 of Wood states:

Preferably the step of remotely accessing the computer network facility comprises providing telephone number information from the computer network facility for remote display to a subscriber identified by

the calling telephone number. The telephone number information can comprise a personal telephone directory of the subscriber, and logged information relating to telephone communications to and/or from the calling telephone number. The step of remotely accessing the computer network facility conveniently comprises operating a web browser.

Thus, in Wood, information may be provided to a subscriber on a display and a subscriber may be identified by a calling telephone number. However, no request for subscriber identification is sent to a subscriber terminal for display. Only telephone number information from the computer network facility, and not a subscriber identification request, is provided for remote display to a subscriber. Wood does not disclose that a request for subscriber identification is sent to the subscriber terminal. Thus, Wood does not teach “sending a subscriber identification request for display at the subscriber terminal,” as recited in the claimed invention. As such, Wood does not anticipate the claimed invention.

Moreover, the cited portion of Wood does not teach “receiving a response to the subscriber identification request including subscriber authentication data,” and “validating the subscriber authentication data,” as recited in the claimed invention. There is no mention in Wood of subscriber authentication data being sent or received in response to the subscriber identification request. In addition, there is no validation of the subscriber authentication data in Wood. Wood is silent as to subscriber authentication data. For these additional reasons, Wood does not teach each and every element of the claimed invention.


Claims 1, 15, and 29 are patentable for the reasons set forth above. Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1 and include all of the limitations of claim 1. Claims 2 and 3 are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Claims 16 and 17 depend from claim 15 and include all of the limitations of claim 15. Claims 16 and 17 are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 15.

Claims 5-14, 19-28, and 31-36 have already been deemed to include allowable subject matter. These claims are additionally allowable based on their dependency from claim 1, 15, or 29, for the reasons argued above.

The present application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's representative regarding any remaining issues in an effort to expedite allowance and issuance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C.

By: 

John R. Witcher, III

Registration No. 39,877

100 Regency Forest Drive, Suite 160

Cary, NC 27518

Telephone: (919) 238-2300

Date: September 11, 2008

Attorney Docket: 7000-452